



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

asked to give it; and this as an unentangled nation, politically considered. It would be a great rôle to play, comparable with that which she had in the war, when it was an issue of force opposed to force, and her 2,000,000 troops in France turned the scales in favor of the opponents of autocracy.

## THERE MIGHT BE A BETTER BEGINNING

**S**OME MEMBERS of the new administration have not made the best possible start. As guests of the Navy League, banqueting amid the salubrities of a fashionable Washington hotel March 5—note the date—the new Secretary of War, the new Secretary of the Navy, and the new Assistant Secretary of the Navy seem prematurely to have returned to the Prussian doctrine of the pathetic few—Hobson, Mahan, Maxim. Our old friend, Col. Robert M. Thompson, honorary president of the Navy League, eclipsed by the lowering clouds of Josephus Daniels, has burst into full glory again. He was present and praised the qualifications of the new Secretary of the Navy. He said: "Imagine what he can do for us in the next four years, starting as he does now, with these qualifications." This was following Secretary Denby's speech, in which he said: "I want a big navy, and I hope we shall conclude our present building program. Our navy should be as large as that of any other nation in the world."

Secretary Weeks, less vehement than Secretary Denby, nevertheless approved the remarks, while Colonel Roosevelt made the old meaningless criticisms of the "Pacifists" quite in the grand style of his illustrious father and with the same wanton disregard of any definition of the word. Nothing in the speeches of any possibility of co-operative reduction of armaments. Nothing of international co-operation in behalf of a constructive peace. They seemed for the most part to repeat the strangely discredited philosophy of Frederick the Great, who said:

"By its nature, my kingdom is military, and, properly speaking, it is only by its help that you must hope to maintain and aggrandize yourself. . . . To make one's self respected and feared by one's neighbors is the very summit of high politics. . . . Above all, endeavor to pass with them for a dangerous man, who knows no other principles but those that lead to glory."

Judging from the reports of the dinner, Count Helmuth von Moltke seemed to have entered the room and to have directed the discourse, for the notion seemed to prevail there, as it did with the great German general field-marshal, that "eternal peace is a dream; not even a beautiful dream; war is a part of God's cosmic system."

In the absence of any references to an international organization for peace, one might assume that Adolf

Lasson, too, with his theories of the kultur ideal and its relation to war had reappeared in the new cabinet. The impression we gather of the meeting is an impression of men believing with Lasson, that "between States there can be but *one* form of right: the right of the strong"; or, as he says later, "The highest right, the last right, depends on the sword. . . . No State which itself is powerful doubts the right of might."

In an ungoverned world such as is ours, the United States needs an efficient navy; but it should be the privilege of every member of the present administration to emphasize now those healing things which soothe the wounds of war. Such "big talk" and from such sources, one day after the inauguration of the new President, talk unmodified by Mr. Harding's challenge to an "autocracy of service," and "to approximate disarmament," is neither enlightening nor as encouraging for our foreign policy as might just now be expected.

## WHAT AND WHOM DOES THIS MEAN?

**R**OOSEVELT HITS PACIFISTS." Under this familiar caption the press quotes from the remarks of Lieutenant-Colonel Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., remarks made at the jollification dinner of the Navy League in Washington, March 5. Colonel Roosevelt is quoted as saying:

"Pacifism in this country is not as dead as I would like to see it. We were unprepared for the last war and we must not forget that wars will come in the future. And yet the pacifists are putting up their heads again with their brittle intellects."

We wish the Colonel would define this word "pacifism," for evidently we are in for a renaissance of tirades against it. It may be a very sad and dangerous "ism." It may be the foul thing that brought on the world war, with its 10,000,000 dead boys and its aftermath of suffering around the world. If it is, it should be anathematized until "dead."

And who are the "pacifists"? From the nature of the word, one may assume that they are men and women concerned to prevent war. If so, they must include those who drafted the Republican platform at Chicago, and such men as Mr. Root, Mr. Harding—indeed, practically all of the Republican leaders of many years, many of them men of widest experience in foreign affairs, men looked upon as representing the aspiration of the American people, Secretaries of State, members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Presidents, including, indeed, the father of our new Assistant Secretary of the Navy. When the Republican platform said, "The Republican party stands for agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world" it expressed the views of pacifists, if our definition be accepted.